arXiv:1510.05288v2 [math.AP] 26 Oct 2015

Radial Limits of Bounded Nonparametric PMC Surfaces

Mozhgan Entekhabi & Kirk E. Lancaster
Department of Mathematics, Statistics & Physics
Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas, 67260-0033

Dedicated to the memory of Alan Ross Elcrat

Abstract

Consider a solution $f \in C^2(\Omega)$ of a prescribed mean curvature equation

$$\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{\nabla f}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla f|^2}}\right) = 2H(x,f) \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a domain whose boundary has a corner at $\mathcal{O} = (0,0) \in \partial\Omega$. If $\sup_{x\in\Omega} |f(x)|$ and $\sup_{x\in\Omega} |H(x,f(x))|$ are both finite and Ω has a reentrant corner at $\mathcal{O}$, then the radial limits of f at $\mathcal{O}$,

$$Rf(\theta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{r\downarrow 0} f(r\cos(\theta), r\sin(\theta)),$$

are shown to exist and to have a specific type of behavior, independent of the boundary behavior of f on $\partial\Omega \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}$. If $\sup_{x\in\Omega} |f(x)|$ and $\sup_{x\in\Omega} |H(x,f(x))|$ are both finite and the trace of f on one side has a limit at $\mathcal{O}$, then the radial limits of f at $\mathcal{O}$ exist and have a specific type of behavior.

1 Introduction and Statement of Main Theorems

Consider the prescribed mean curvature equation

$$Nf = 2H(\cdot, f) \ \text{ in } \ \Omega \tag{1}$$

where Ω is a domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ whose boundary has a corner at $\mathcal{O} \in \partial\Omega$, $Nf = \nabla \cdot Tf = \operatorname{div}(Tf)$, $Tf = \frac{\nabla f}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla f|^2}}$, $H : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and H satisfies one of the

conditions which guarantees that "cusp solutions" (e.g. §5 of [9], [11]) do not exist; for example, $H(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is strictly increasing in t for each $\mathbf{x}$ or is real-analytic (e.g. constant). We will assume $\mathcal{O} = (0, 0)$. Let $\Omega^* = \Omega \cap B_{\delta^*}(\mathcal{O})$, where $B_{\delta^*}(\mathcal{O})$ is the ball in $\mathbb{R}^2$ of radius δ^* about $\mathcal{O}$. Polar coordinates relative to $\mathcal{O}$ will be denoted by r and θ. We assume that $\partial\Omega$ is piecewise smooth and there exists $\alpha \in (0, \pi)$ such that $\partial\Omega \cap B_{\delta^*}(\mathcal{O})$ consists of two arcs $\partial^+\Omega^*$ and $\partial^-\Omega^*$, whose tangent lines approach the lines $L^+ : \theta = \alpha$ and $L^- : \theta = -\alpha$, respectively, as the point $\mathcal{O}$ is approached (see Figure 1 of [10] or Figure 1).



Figure 1: The domain Ω^*

Suppose

$$\sup_{x\in\Omega} |f(x)| < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{x\in\Omega} |H(x, f(x))| < \infty. \tag{2}$$

We shall prove

Theorem 1. *Let $f \in C^2(\Omega)$ satisfy (1) and suppose (2) holds and $\alpha \in \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi\right)$. Then for each $\theta \in (-\alpha, \alpha)$,*

$$Rf(\theta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{r\downarrow 0} f(r\cos(\theta), r\sin(\theta))$$

exists and $Rf(\cdot)$ is a continuous function on $(-\alpha, \alpha)$ which behaves in one of the following ways:
(i) $Rf : (-\alpha, \alpha) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a constant function (i.e. f has a nontangential limit at $\mathcal{O}$).
(ii) There exist α_1 and α_2 so that $-\alpha \le \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \le \alpha$ and Rf is constant on $(-\alpha, \alpha_1]$ and $[\alpha_2, \alpha)$ and strictly increasing or strictly decreasing on (α_1, α_2).
(iii) There exist $\alpha_1, \alpha_L, \alpha_R, \alpha_2$ so that $-\alpha \le \alpha_1 < \alpha_L < \alpha_R < \alpha_2 \le \alpha, \alpha_R = \alpha_L + \pi$, and Rf is constant on $(-\alpha, \alpha_1], [\alpha_L, \alpha_R]$, and $[\alpha_2, \alpha)$ and either strictly increasing on $(\alpha_1, \alpha_L]$ and strictly decreasing on $[\alpha_R, \alpha_2)$ or strictly decreasing on $(\alpha_1, \alpha_L]$ and strictly increasing on $[\alpha_R, \alpha_2)$.

At a convex corner (i.e. $\alpha \in \left(0, \frac{\pi}{2}\right]$), Theorem 1 is not applicable. The additional assumption that the trace of f on one side (e.g. $\partial^-\Omega^*$) has a limit at $\mathcal{O}$ implies the radial limits of f exist.

Theorem 2. *Let $f \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C^0\left(\Omega \cup \partial^- \Omega^* \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}\right)$ satisfy (1). Suppose (2) holds and $m = \lim_{\partial^- \Omega^* \ni \mathbf{x} \to \mathcal{O}} f(\mathbf{x})$ exists. Then for each $\theta \in (-\alpha, \alpha)$, $Rf(\theta)$ exists and $Rf(\cdot)$ is a continuous function on $[-\alpha, \alpha)$, where $Rf(-\alpha) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} m$. If $\alpha \in \left(0, \frac{\pi}{2}\right]$, Rf can behave as in (i) or (ii) in Theorem 1. If $\alpha \in \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi\right)$, Rf can behave as in (i), (ii) or (iii) in Theorem 1.*

The conclusions of these theorems were first obtained in [4] for minimal surfaces satisfying Dirichlet boundary conditions and then for nonparametric prescribed mean curvature surfaces satisfying Dirichlet ([2, 6]) or contact angle ([9]) boundary conditions; see also [3, 8]. Notice that Theorem 1 applies to a solution of a capillary surface problem whose domain has a reentrant corner even when the contact angle equals 0 and/or π on some (or all) of $\partial\Omega^*$.

Remark: *Notice that the assumption that Ω has a reentrant corner at $\mathcal{O} \in \partial\Omega$ or that the trace of f from one side of $\partial\Omega$ is continuous at $\mathcal{O}$ is critical here; the nonexistence of radial limits at $(1, 0)$ when $\Omega = B_1(\mathcal{O})$ and the boundary data is symmetric with respect to the horizontal axis is demonistrated in [7] and in Theorem 3 of [9]. In [5], the second author conjectured the existence of radial limits at corners for bounded solutions of Dirichlet problems for the minimal surface equation in $\mathbb{R}^2$, independent of boundary conditions. Although [7] proved this conjecture false, Theorems 1 and 2 show it is true in many cases.*

2 Proof of Theorem 1

Since $f \in C^2(\Omega)$ (and so in $C^0(\Omega)$), we may assume that f is uniformly continuous on $\{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega^* \ : \ |\mathbf{x}| > \delta\}$ for each $\delta \in (0, \delta^*)$; if this is not true, we may replace Ω with U, $U \subset \Omega$, such that $\partial\Omega \cap \partial U = \{\mathcal{O}\}$ and $\partial U \cap B_{\delta^*}(\mathcal{O})$ consists of two arcs $\partial^+ U$ and $\partial^- U$, whose tangent lines approach the lines $L^+ : \theta = \alpha$ and $L^- : \theta = -\alpha$, respectively, as the point $\mathcal{O}$ is approached. Set

$$S_0^* = \{(\mathbf{x}, f(\mathbf{x})) : \mathbf{x} \in \Omega^*\}$$

and

$$\Gamma_0^* = \{(\mathbf{x}, f(\mathbf{x})) : \mathbf{x} \in \partial\Omega^* \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}\};$$

the points where $\partial B_{\delta^*}(\mathcal{O})$ intersect $\partial\Omega$ are labeled $A \in \partial^-\Omega^*$ and $B \in \partial^+\Omega^*$. From the calculation on page 170 of [9], we see that the area of S_0^* is finite; let M_0 denote this area. For $\delta \in (0, 1)$, set

$$p(\delta) = \sqrt{\frac{8\pi M_0}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}}.$$

Let $E = \{(u, v) : u^2 + v^2 < 1\}$. As in [2, 9], there is a parametric description of the surface S_0^*,

$$Y(u, v) = (a(u, v), b(u, v), c(u, v)) \in C^2(E : \mathbb{R}^3), \tag{3}$$

which has the following properties:
(a_1) Y is a diffeomorphism of E onto S_0^*.
(a_2) Set $G(u,v) = (a(u,v), b(u,v))$, $(u,v) \in E$. Then $G \in C^0(\overline{E} : \mathbb{R}^2)$.
(a_3) Let $\sigma = G^{-1}(\partial\Omega_1 \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\})$; then σ is a connected arc of ∂E and Y maps σ strictly monotonically onto Γ_0^*. We may assume the endpoints of σ are $\mathbf{o}_1$ and $\mathbf{o}_2$ and there exist points $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \sigma$ such that $G(\mathbf{a}) = A$, $G(\mathbf{b}) = B$, G maps the (open) arc $\mathbf{o}_1\mathbf{b}$ onto $\partial^+\Omega$, and G maps the (open) arc $\mathbf{o}_2\mathbf{a}$ onto $\partial^-\Omega$. (Note that $\mathbf{o}_1$ and $\mathbf{o}_2$ are not assumed to be distinct at this point; one of Figure 4a or 4b of [10] illustrates this situation.)
(a_4) Y is conformal on E: $Y_u \cdot Y_v = 0, Y_u \cdot Y_u = Y_v \cdot Y_v$ on E.
(a_5) $\triangle Y := Y_{uu} + Y_{vv} = H(Y)\, Y_u \times Y_v$ on E.
Here by the (open) arcs $\mathbf{o}_1\mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{o}_2\mathbf{a}$ are meant the component of $\partial E \setminus \{\mathbf{o}_1, \mathbf{b}\}$ which does not contain $\mathbf{a}$ and the component of $\partial E \setminus \{\mathbf{o}_2, \mathbf{a}\}$ which does not contain $\mathbf{b}$ respectively. Let $\sigma_0 = \partial E \setminus \sigma$.

There are two cases we wish to consider:

(A) $\mathbf{o}_1 = \mathbf{o}_2$.

(B) $\mathbf{o}_1 \neq \mathbf{o}_2$.

These correspond to Cases 5 and 3 respectively in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 1 of [9].

Let us first assume that (A) holds and set $\mathbf{o} = \mathbf{o}_1 = \mathbf{o}_2$. Let h denote a function on the annulus $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathbf{x} : r_1 \leq |\mathbf{x}| \leq r_2\}$ which vanishes on the circle $|\mathbf{x}| = r_2$ and whose graph is an unduloid surface with constant mean curvature $-H_0$ which becomes vertical at $|\mathbf{x}| = r_1$ and at $|\mathbf{x}| = r_2$ (see Figure 2) for suitable $r_1 < r_2$ (e.g. [9], pp. 170-1). Let q denote the modulus of continuity of h (i.e. $|h(\mathbf{x}_1) - h(\mathbf{x}_2)| \leq q(|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2|)$. For each $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $|\mathbf{p}| = r_1$, set $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}) = \{\mathbf{x} : r_1 \leq |\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}| \leq r_2\}$ and define $h_{\mathbf{p}} : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}) \to \mathbb{R}$ by $h_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{x}) = h(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p})$.

For $r > 0$, set $B_r = \{\mathbf{u} \in \overline{E} : |\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{o}| < r\}$, $C_r = \{\mathbf{u} \in \overline{E} : |\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{o}| = r\}$ and let l_r be the length of the image curve $Y(C_r)$; also let $C_r' = G(C_r)$ and $B_r' = G(B_r)$. From the Courant-Lebesgue Lemma (e.g. Lemma 3.1 in [1]), we see that for each $\delta \in (0,1)$, there exists a $\rho = \rho(\delta) \in \left(\delta, \sqrt{\delta}\right)$ such that the arclength l_ρ of $Y(C_\rho)$ is less than $p(\delta)$. For $\delta > 0$, let $k(\delta) = \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in C_{\rho(\delta)}} c(\mathbf{u}) = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in C'_{\rho(\delta)}} f(\mathbf{x})$ and $m(\delta) = \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in C_{\rho(\delta)}} c(\mathbf{u}) = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in C'_{\rho(\delta)}} f(\mathbf{x})$; notice that $m(\delta) - k(\delta) \leq l_\rho < p(\delta)$.

For each $\delta \in (0,1)$ with $\sqrt{\delta} < \min\{|\mathbf{o} - \mathbf{a}|, |\mathbf{o} - \mathbf{b}|\}$, there are two points in $C_{\rho(\delta)} \cap \partial E$; we denote these points as $\mathbf{e}_1(\delta) \in \mathbf{ob}$ and $\mathbf{e}_2(\delta) \in \mathbf{oa}$ and set $\mathbf{y}_1(\delta) = G(\mathbf{e}_1(\delta))$ and $\mathbf{y}_2(\delta) = G(\mathbf{e}_2(\delta))$. Notice that $C'_{\rho(\delta)}$ is a curve in $\overline{\Omega}$ which joins $\mathbf{y}_1 \in \partial^+\Omega^*$ and $\mathbf{y}_2 \in \partial^-\Omega^*$ and $\partial\Omega \cap C'_{\rho(\delta)} \setminus \{\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2\} = \emptyset$; therefore there exists $\eta = \eta(\delta) > 0$ such that $B_{\eta(\delta)}(\mathcal{O}) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega : |\mathbf{x}| < \eta(\delta)\} \subset B'_{\rho(\delta)}$ (see Figure 3).

Fix $\delta_0 \in (0, \delta^*)$ with $\sqrt{\delta_0} < \min\{|\mathbf{o} - \mathbf{a}|, |\mathbf{o} - \mathbf{b}|\}$. Let $\mathbf{p}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfy $|\mathbf{p}_1| = r_1$ and $|\mathbf{p}_1 - \mathbf{y}_1(\delta_0)| = r_1$ such that $\mathbf{p}_1$ lies below (and to the left of) the line through $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathbf{y}_1(\delta_0)$. Let $\mathbf{p}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfy $|\mathbf{p}_2| = r_1$ and $|\mathbf{p}_2 - \mathbf{y}_2(\delta_0)| = r_1$



Figure 2: The graph of h over $\mathcal{A}$

such that $\mathbf{p}_2$ lies above (and to the left of) the line through $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathbf{y}_2(\delta_0)$. Set $\Omega_0 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega^* \ : \ |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}_1| > r_1\} \cup \{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega^* \ : \ |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}_2| > r_1\}$ (see Figure 4).

Claim: f is uniformly continuous on Ω_0.

Pf: Let $\epsilon > 0$. Choose $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ such that $p(\delta) + q(p(\delta)) < \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ and $p(\delta) < r_2 - r_1$. Pick a point $\mathbf{w} \in C'_{\rho(\delta)}$ and define $b_j^{\pm} : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_j) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$b_j^{\pm}(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{w}) \pm p(\delta) \pm h_{\mathbf{p}_j}(\mathbf{x}), \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_j)$$

for $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Notice that

$$b_j^-(\mathbf{x}) < f(\mathbf{x}) < b_j^+(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{ for } \ \mathbf{x} \in B'_{\rho(\delta)} \cap \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_j), \qquad j \in \{1, 2\}.$$

If $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \Omega_0$ satisfy $|\mathbf{x}_1| < \eta(\delta)$ and $|\mathbf{x}_2| < \eta(\delta)$, then there exist $\mathbf{x}_3 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_1) \cap \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_2)$ with $|\mathbf{x}_3| < \eta(\delta)$ such that $|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_3| < \eta(\delta)$ and $|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_3| < \eta(\delta)$ and so

$$|f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}_2)| \leq |f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}_3)| + |f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}_3)| < 4p(\delta) + 4q\left(p(\delta)\right) < \epsilon. \quad (4)$$

Since f is uniformly continuous on $\{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega^* \ : \ |\mathbf{x}| \geq \frac{1}{2}\eta(\delta)\}$, there exists a $\lambda > 0$ such that if $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \Omega^*$ satisfy $|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2| \geq \frac{1}{2}\eta(\delta)$ and $|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2| < \lambda$, then $|f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}_2)| < \epsilon$. Now set $d = d(\epsilon) = \min\{\lambda, \frac{1}{2}\eta(\delta)\}$. If $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \Omega_0$, $|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2| < d(\epsilon) \leq \frac{1}{2}\eta(\delta)$ and $|\mathbf{x}_1| < \frac{1}{2}\eta(\delta)$, then $|\mathbf{x}_1| < \eta(\delta)$ and $|\mathbf{x}_2| < \eta(\delta)$; hence $|f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}_2)| < \epsilon$ by (4). Next, if $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \Omega_0$, $|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2| < d(\epsilon) \leq \lambda$, $|\mathbf{x}_1| \geq \frac{1}{2}\eta(\delta)$ and $|\mathbf{x}_2| \geq \frac{1}{2}\eta(\delta)$, then $|f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}_2)| < \epsilon$. Therefore, for all $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \Omega_0$ with $|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2| < d(\epsilon)$, we have $|f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}_2)| < \epsilon$. The claim is proven.



Figure 3: $\Omega^* \cap \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_1)$, $C'_{\rho(\delta)}$ (blue curve), $B_{\eta(\delta)}(\mathcal{O}) \cap \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_1)$ (yellow)

If $\{(r\cos(\theta^-(\delta_0)), r\sin(\theta^-(\delta_0))) : r \geq 0\}$ is the tangent ray to $\partial\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_2)$ at $\mathcal{O}$, $\{(r\cos(\theta^+(\delta_0)), r\sin(\theta^+(\delta_0))) : r \geq 0\}$ is the tangent ray to $\partial\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_1)$ at $\mathcal{O}$ and $\theta^-(\delta_0), \theta^+(\delta_0) \in (-\alpha, \alpha)$, then it follows from the Claim that $f \in C^0(\overline{\Omega_0})$, the radial limits $Rf(\theta)$ of f at $\mathcal{O}$ exist for $\theta \in [\theta^-(\delta_0), \theta^+(\delta_0)]$ and the radial limits are identical (i.e. $Rf(\theta) = f(\mathcal{O})$ for all $\theta \in [\theta^-(\delta_0), \theta^+(\delta_0)]$.) Since

$$\lim_{\delta_0 \downarrow 0} \theta^-(\delta_0) = -\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\delta_0 \downarrow 0} \theta^+(\delta_0) = \alpha, \tag{5}$$

Theorem 1 is proven in this case.

Let us next assume that (B) holds. For $r > 0$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$, set $B_r^j = \{\mathbf{u} \in \overline{E} : |\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{o}_j| < r\}$, $C_r^j = \{\mathbf{u} \in \overline{E} : |\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{o}_j| = r\}$, and let l_r^j be the length of the image curve $Y(C_r^j)$; also let $C_r^{j,\prime} = G(C_r^j)$ and $B_r^{j,\prime} = G(B_r^j)$. From the Courant-Lebesgue Lemma, we see that for each $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$, there exists a $\rho_j = \rho_j(\delta) \in \left(\delta, \sqrt{\delta}\right)$ such that the arclength $l_{j,\rho}$ of $Y(C_{\rho_j}^j)$ is less than $p(\delta)$.

We will only consider $\delta \leq \delta_0$, where δ_0 is small enough that the endpoints of $C_{\rho_j(\delta)}^j$ lie on $\sigma_0 \cup \sigma_N^j$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$ and $C_{\sqrt{\delta_0}}^1 \cap C_{\sqrt{\delta_0}}^2 = \emptyset$, where $\sigma_N^1 = \mathbf{o}_1\mathbf{b}$ and $\sigma_N^2 = \mathbf{o}_2\mathbf{a}$. For each $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$, the fact that $l_{j,\ \rho_j(\delta)}$ is finite for $j \in \{1, 2\}$ implies that

$$\lim_{C_{\rho_j(\delta)}^{j,\prime} \ni \mathbf{x} \to \mathcal{O}} f(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{exists for} \quad j \in \{1, 2\}.$$



Figure 4: Ω_0



Figure 5: $E \setminus \left(\overline{B^1_{\rho_1(\delta)}} \cup \overline{B^2_{\rho_2(\delta)}}\right)$ and Ω_1

If we set $\Omega_1 = G\left(E \setminus \left(\overline{B^1_{\rho_1(\delta)}} \cup \overline{B^2_{\rho_2(\delta)}}\right)\right)$ and define $\phi : \partial\Omega_1 \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\phi = f$, then ϕ has (at worst) a jump discontinuity at $\mathcal{O}$. If we consider ϕ to be the Dirichlet data for the boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(Th) &= 2H(\cdot, f) \quad \text{in } \Omega_1 && (6)\\ f &= \phi \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_1 \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}, && (7) \end{aligned}$$

then we may parametrize the graph of f over Ω_1 in isothermal coordinates as above and the arguments in [2, 6, 9] can be used to show that c is uniformly continuous on Ω_1 and so extends to be continuous on $\overline{\Omega_1}$ (i.e. Let $k : E \setminus \left(\overline{B^1_{\rho_1(\delta)}} \cup \overline{B^2_{\rho_2(\delta)}}\right) \to E$ be a conformal map. From [2, 6, 9], we see that $c \circ k^{-1} \in$

$C^0(\overline{E})$ and so $c \in C^0\left(\overline{E \setminus \left(B^1_{\rho_1(\delta)} \cup B^2_{\rho_2(\delta)}\right)}\right)$.) Since

$$\bigcup_{\delta \in (0,1)} \left(E \setminus \left(B^1_{\rho_1(\delta)} \cup B^2_{\rho_2(\delta)}\right)\right) = E,$$

we see $c \in C^0\left(\overline{E} \setminus \{\mathbf{o}_1, \mathbf{o}_2\}\right)$.

As at the end of Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 1 of [9], we define $X : B \to \mathbb{R}^3$ by $X = Y \circ g$ and $K : B \to \mathbb{R}^2$ by $K = G \circ g$, where $B = \{(u,v) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : u^2 + v^2 < 1,\ v > 0\}$ and $g : \overline{B} \to \overline{E}$ is an indirectly conformal (or anticonformal) map from $\overline{B}$ onto $\overline{E}$ such that $g(1,0) = \mathbf{o}_1$, $g(-1,0) = \mathbf{o}_2$ and $g(u,0) \in \mathbf{o}_1\mathbf{o}_2$ for each $u \in [-1,1]$. Notice that $K(u,0) = \mathcal{O}$ for $u \in [-1,1]$ (see Figure 6). Set $x = a \circ g$, $y = b \circ g$ and $z = c \circ g$, so that $X(u,v) = (x(u,v), y(u,v), z(u,v))$ for $(u,v) \in B$. Now, from Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 1 of [9],

$$X \in C^0\left(\overline{B} \setminus \{(\pm 1, 0)\} : \mathbb{R}^3\right) \cap C^{1,\iota}\left(B \cup \{(u,0) : -1 < u < 1\} : \mathbb{R}^3\right)$$

for some $\iota \in (0,1)$ and $X(u,0) = (0,0,z(u,0))$ cannot be constant on any nondegenerate interval in $(-1,1)$. Define $\Theta(u) = \arg\left(x_v(u,0) + iy_v(u,0)\right)$. From equation (12) of [9], we see that

$$\alpha_1 = \lim_{u \downarrow -1} \Theta(u) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_2 = \lim_{u \uparrow 1} \Theta(u);$$

here $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$. As in Steps 2-5 of the proof of Theorem 1 of [9], we see that $Rf(\theta)$ exists when $\theta \in (\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$,

$$\overline{G^{-1}\left(L(\alpha_2)\right)} \cap \partial E = \{\mathbf{o}_1\} \ \ (\text{and } \overline{K^{-1}\left(L(\alpha_2)\right)} \cap \partial B = \{(1,0)\}) \ \text{ when } \ \alpha_2 < \alpha$$

$$\overline{G^{-1}\left(L(\alpha_1)\right)} \cap \partial E = \{\mathbf{o}_2\} \ \ (\text{and } \overline{K^{-1}\left(L(\alpha_1)\right)} \cap \partial B = \{(-1,0)\}) \ \text{ when } \ \alpha_1 > -\alpha$$

where $L(\theta) = \{(r\cos(\theta), r\sin(\theta)) \in \Omega : 0 < r < \delta^*\}$, and one of the following cases holds:

(a) Rf is strictly increasing or strictly decreasing on (α_1, α_2).

(b) There exist α_L, α_R so that $\alpha_1 < \alpha_L < \alpha_R < \alpha_2$, $\alpha_R = \alpha_L + \pi$, and Rf is constant on $[\alpha_L, \alpha_R]$ and either increasing on $(\alpha_1, \alpha_L]$ and decreasing on $[\alpha_R, \alpha_2)$ or decreasing on $(\alpha_1, \alpha_L]$ and increasing on $[\alpha_R, \alpha_2)$.

If $\alpha_2 = \alpha$ and $\alpha_1 = -\alpha$, then Theorem 1 is proven. Otherwise, suppose $\alpha_2 < \alpha$ and fix $\delta_0 \in (0, \delta^*)$ and Ω_0 (see Figure 4) as before in case (i).

Claim: Suppose $\alpha_2 < \alpha$. Then f is uniformly continuous on Ω_0^+, where

$$\Omega_0^+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(r\cos(\theta), r\sin(\theta)) \in \Omega_0 : 0 < r < \delta^*, \alpha_2 < \theta < \pi\}.$$

Pf: Suppose $\alpha - \alpha_2 < \pi$ (see the blue region in Figure 6). Let $\epsilon > 0$. Choose $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ such that $p(\delta) + q(p(\delta)) < \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ and $p(\delta) < r_2 - r_1$. Let $C_r = \{(u,v) \in \overline{B} : |(u,v) - (1,0)| = r\}$ and let l_r be the arclength of the image curve $X(C_r)$. The



Figure 6: $L(\alpha_2)$, $K^{-1}(L(\alpha_2))$ (blue curves); $L(\alpha_1)$, $K^{-1}(L(\alpha_1))$ (green curves)

Courant-Lebesgue Lemma implies that for each $\delta \in (0,1)$, there exists a $\rho(\delta) \in \left(\delta, \sqrt{\delta}\right)$ such that $l_{\rho(\delta)} < p(\delta)$. Denote the endpoints of $C_{\rho(\delta)}$ as $(u_1(\delta), v_1(\delta))$ and $(u_2(\delta), 0)$, where $(u_1(\delta))^2 + (v_1(\delta))^2 = 1$, $v_1(\delta) > 0$ and $u_2(\delta) \in (-1,1)$. Notice $\Theta(u_2(\delta)) < \alpha_2$; let us assume that δ is small enough that $\alpha - \Theta(u_2(\delta)) < \pi$.

Now $X\left(C_{\rho(\delta)}\right)$ is a curve whose tangent ray at $\mathcal{O}$ exists and has direction $\theta = \Theta(u_2(\delta))$ and $\partial\Omega \cap X\left(C_{\rho(\delta)} \setminus \{(u_1(\delta), v_1(\delta)), (u_2(\delta), 0)\}\right) = \emptyset$; hence there exists $\eta = \eta(\delta) > 0$ such that $\{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega_0^+ : |\mathbf{x}| < \eta(\delta)\}$ (the red region in Figure 7) is a subset of $\Omega_0 \cap X\left(\{(u,v) \in \overline{B} : |(u,v) - (1,0)| < \rho(\delta)\}\right)$ (the yellow region plus the red region in Figure 7). From (4) and the arguments in the proof of the Claim in case (i), we see that f is uniformly continuous on Ω_0^+.

Notice that if $\alpha - \alpha_2 \geq \pi$, then we argue as in the proof of the Claim in case (i) and see that f is uniformly continuous on Ω_0^+. Thus, the Claim is proven.

Thus $f \in C^0\left(\overline{\Omega_0^+}\right)$; hence (5) implies

$$Rf(\theta) = \lim_{\tau \uparrow \alpha_2} Rf(\tau) \quad \text{for all } \theta \in [\alpha_2, \alpha).$$

Suppose $\alpha_1 > -\alpha$. Then, as above, f is uniformly continuous on

$$\Omega_0^- \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(r\cos(\theta), r\sin(\theta)) \in \Omega_0 : 0 < r < \delta^*, -\pi < \theta < \alpha_1\}$$

and $f \in C^0\left(\overline{\Omega_0^-}\right)$; hence (5) implies

$$Rf(\theta) = \lim_{\tau \downarrow \alpha_2} Rf(\tau) \quad \text{for all } \theta \in (-\alpha, \alpha_1].$$

Thus Theorem 1 is proven.

3 Proof of Theorem 2

The parametric representation (3) with properties $(a_1) - (a_5)$ continues to be valid and either case (A) or case (B) holds true.



Figure 7: $\Omega^* \cap \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_1)$ (blue, yellow & red regions), $\partial B_{\eta(\delta)}(\mathcal{O})$ (blue circle)

Suppose case (A) holds. Let q_1 denote the modulus of continuity of the trace of f on the (closed) set $\partial^-\Omega^*$ (i.e. $|f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}_2)| \leq q_1(|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2|)$ if $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \partial^-\Omega^*$). Fix $\delta_0 \in (0, \delta^*)$ with $\sqrt{\delta_0} < \min\{|\mathbf{o} - \mathbf{a}|, |\mathbf{o} - \mathbf{b}|\}$. Let $\mathbf{p}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfy $|\mathbf{p}_1| = r_1$ and $|\mathbf{p}_1 - \mathbf{y}_1(\delta_0)| = r_1$ such that $\mathbf{p}_1$ lies above (and to the left of) the line through $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathbf{y}_1(\delta_0)$. Set $\Omega_0 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega^* \ : \ |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}_1| > r_1\}$.

Claim: f is uniformly continuous on Ω_0.

Pf: Let $\epsilon > 0$. Choose $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ such that $p(\delta) + q(p(\delta)) + q_1(p(\delta)) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $p(\delta) < r_2 - r_1$. Pick a point $\mathbf{w} \in C'_{\rho(\delta)}$ and define $b_1^{\pm} : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_1) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$b_1^{\pm}(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{w}) \pm p(\delta) \pm h_{\mathbf{p}_1}(\mathbf{x}), \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_1).$$

Notice that

$$b_1^-(\mathbf{x}) < f(\mathbf{x}) < b_1^+(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{ for } \ \mathbf{x} \in B'_{\rho(\delta)} \cap \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_1).$$

Now there exists $\eta = \eta(\delta) > 0$ such that $\{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega_0 : |\mathbf{x}| < \eta(\delta)\}$ (the red regions in Figure 8) is a subset of $B'_{\rho(\delta)} \cap \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_1)$ (the yellow regions plus the red regions in Figure 8). Thus, for $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \Omega_0$ satisfying $|\mathbf{x}_1| < \eta(\delta)$, $|\mathbf{x}_2| < \eta(\delta)$, we have

$$|f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}_2)| < 2p(\delta) + 2q\left(p(\delta)\right) + 2q_1\left(p(\delta)\right) < \epsilon.$$

The remander of the proof of the claim follows as before.



Figure 8: $\Omega_0 \cap \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{p}_1)$ (blue, yellow & red regions), $\partial B_{\eta(\delta)}(\mathcal{O})$ (blue circle)

The proof of Theorem 2 in this case now follows the proof of Theorem 1 in the same case.

If case (B) holds, then the proof of Theorem 2 is essentially the same as the proof of Theorem 1; the only significant difference is that $z \in C^0\left(\overline{B} \setminus \{(1,0)\}\right)$ (and $c \in C^0\left(\overline{E} \setminus \{\mathbf{o}_1\}\right)$) and hence $Rf(\theta)$ exists for $\theta \in [-\alpha, \alpha)$.

References

[1] R. Courant, *Dirichlet's Principle, Conformal Mapping, and Minimal Surfaces*, Interscience, New York, 1950.

[2] A. Elcrat and K. E. Lancaster, *Boundary behavior of a nonparametric surface of prescribed mean curvature near a reentrant corner*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **297** (1986), 645–650.

[3] Z. Jin and K. E. Lancaster, *Behavior of solutions for some Dirichlet problems near reentrant corners*, Indiana Uni. Math. J. **46** (1997), 827–862.

[4] K. E. Lancaster, *Boundary behavior of a non-parametric minimal surface in* $\mathbb{R}^3$ *at a non-convex point*, Analysis **5** (1985), 61–69. Corrigendum: Analysis **6** (1986), 413.

[5] K. E. Lancaster, *Boundary Behavior of Nonparametric Minimal Surfaces-Some Theorems and Conjectures*, 37–41, in Variational Methods for Free Surface Interfaces, 1987.

[6] K. E. Lancaster, *Nonparametric minimal surfaces in* $\mathbb{R}^3$ *whose boundaries have a jump discontinuity*, Inter. J. Math. Math. Sci. **11** (1988), 651–656.

[7] K. E. Lancaster, *Existence and nonexistence of radial limits of minimal surfaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **106** (1989), 757–762.

[8] K. E. Lancaster, *Boundary behavior near reentrant corners for solutions of certain elliptic equations*, Rend. Circ. Matem. Palermo (2) **40** (1991), 189–214.

[9] K. E. Lancaster and D. Siegel, *Existence and Behavior of the Radial Limits of a Bounded Capillary Surface at a Corner*, Pacific J. Math. **Vol. 176**, No. 1 (1996), 165–194.

[10] K. E. Lancaster and D. Siegel, *Correction to "Existence and Behavior of the Radial Limits of a Bounded Capillary Surface at a Corner"*, Pacific J. Math. **Vol. 179**, No. 2 (1997), 397–402.

[11] K. E. Lancaster and D. Siegel, *Behavior of a Bounded Non-Parametric H-Surface Near a Reentrant Corner*, Zeitschrift fr Analysis und ihre Anwendungen **15**, no. 4 (1996), 819–850.